

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 3206 of 1989

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE C.K.BUCH

- =====
1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : YES
  2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO
  3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO
  4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO
  5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

-----  
MEGHANINAGAR JANATA JAGRUTI MANDAL DIVISION NO 1 TO 4

Versus

GUJARAT HOUSING BOARD  
-----

Appearance:

MR MANOJ SHRIMALI FOR MR GIRISH PATEL for Petitioner  
MISS ARCHANA RAVAL FOR MRS KETTY A MEHTA for Respondent No.1  
MR SN SHELAT for Respondent No. 2  
-----

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE C.K.BUCH

Date of decision: 03/03/2000

ORAL JUDGEMENT

Heard learned counsel Mr. Manoj Shrimali for  
learned counsel Mr. Girish Patel for the petitioners and  
Miss Archana Raval, learned counsel for Respondent  
Gujarat Housing Board.

During the course of submissions, my attention has been drawn to page 57 of the petitioner viz. order passed by this Court ( Coram : R.C.Mankad, Actg.C.J. & N.B. Patel, J ) in Special Civil Application No. 2926/89. Considering the nature of the reliefs prayed by the petitioners and averments made in the petition, I am satisfied that the submission of learned counsel Miss Raval has enough force that the order passed by this Court in the above-referred petition squarely covers the issues raised by the petitioners in the present petition. Hence, in my view, issues raised by the petitioners in the present petition, being covered by the order passed in the above-referred order, I do not find any merits in the matter.

Learned Counsel Mr. Girish Patel, at this stage, submitted that liberty to revive this petition be reserved as an issue involving responsibility of respondent No.2 Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation, is also involved in the petition. There is enough strength in this submission canvassed by learned counsel Mr. Girish Patel for the petitioner.

In the result, petition is dismissed with a liberty to revive the petition in case of difficulty as prayed for. Rule is discharged. Considering the nature of issues involved, I am not inclined to pass any order as to costs.

3.3.2000 [ C.K. BUCH, J]

\*rawal